

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Prince George's County Public Schools for achieving a record high school graduation rate. Prince George's schools are living up to their motto of being Great By Choice.

Eight schools have met the goal of graduating 90 percent of seniors within 4 years, including three schools in the Fourth Congressional District: Charles Herbert Flowers High School, DuVal High School, and the Academy of Health Sciences at Prince George's Community College.

Many schools in the Fourth District, including Suitland, Potomac, and Forestville high schools have demonstrated real progress, with graduation rate gains of more than 4 percentage points.

Mr. Speaker, these gains have been made possible by the incredible dedication of educators and parents who are focused on policies that improve student success like expanding mentoring programs, effectively using data to target student needs, and emphasizing core reading and math skills.

Mr. Speaker, we must prepare students for successful lives and careers once they graduate from high school. That is why I am committed to working during this Congress to ensure every student has access to rigorous, relevant, and results-driven career technology education programs to equip them with the skills to succeed in the 21st century.

STRANGER THINGS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, like the main characters in "Stranger Things," we are now stuck in the "Upside Down." Right is wrong. Up is down. Black is white.

The White House deceives the American public for weeks about their contacts with Russia, but an Attorney General who followed her conscience is fired.

Executive orders are signed to ban Muslims in order to keep us safe, while top secret national security conversations are held out in the open.

President Trump showers praise on a thug like Vladimir Putin, while threatening and bullying our longstanding allies.

President Trump signs an executive order to spend \$20 billion on a border wall, while Flint, Michigan, still goes without clean drinking water.

Mr. Speaker, mornings might be for coffee and contemplation, but Chief Jim Hopper is not coming to rescue us. This is not a TV show. This is real life.

We have a President unlike any we have ever known. And like Mike, Dustin, Lucas, and Eleven, we must remain focused on the task at hand and hold this administration accountable so we can escape from our own version of the "Upside Down."

INTEGRITY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is known for many things. It is known for its integrity, its honesty, and its high moral compass.

We are well aware that the United States intelligence community is united in its assessment that Russia attacked our Nation in 2016, and interfered in our elections. In response, President Obama imposed sanctions on the Russian Government and personnel entities, including intelligence services. He also expelled dozens of Russian officials from the United States. Now, we know that General Flynn, in violation of many laws, intruded and discussed these issues with the Russian Ambassador.

His departure does not end this investigation. Who knew what, when? When did the President know it? The integrity of this country is higher and more superior than one individual.

Why, when other Presidents have used Camp David and the White House for international diplomacy most often, did we have, over the past weekend, the embarrassment of international and national security issues, and personnel being filmed in an ordinary restaurant owned by the President?

Finally, let me say, with the many hundreds of thousands of DACA children who need relief, the question is: Can the President attend to serious business fighting for these young people and saving lives?

WE DESERVE TO KNOW

(Mr. RUPPERSBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, we live in a dangerous world, and the President needs a National Security Adviser who isn't under a cloud of suspicion. But this resignation isn't the end. Americans now deserve to know if General Flynn was operating under anyone else's authority.

The American people deserve to know if Russia has financial, personal, or political grip on President Trump or his campaign. I am urging the agencies involved in the investigation to continue their important work vigorously.

I also ask my colleagues in House leadership to launch a bipartisan, independent congressional investigation into Russia's influence on the election and the new administration.

Lastly, I once again am calling on President Trump to remove his cheap political strategist, Steve Bannon, from the National Security Council and reinstate the Director of National Intelligence and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to restore some semblance of respectability to the organization's structure.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER) laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and the Workforce:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 16, 2017.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Due to my election to the Committee on Ways and Means, this letter is to inform you that I resign my seats on the House Judiciary committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL D. BISHOP.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Smith of Missouri, to rank immediately after Mr. Johnson of Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Russell, to rank immediately after Mr. Grothman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Mr. Bishop of Michigan.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF FINAL RULE OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 123, I

call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of the Interior relating to “Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska”, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 123, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 69

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to “Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska” (81 Fed. Reg. 52247 (August 5, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 69.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the only Member of Congress in the House from Alaska, the dean of the Republican side.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for bringing this legislation to the floor.

H.J. Res. 69 is very simple. It overturns an illegal rule by the Obama administration—an illegal rule.

This House created the State of Alaska in 1959, under the Statehood Act. It clearly granted Alaska full authority to manage fish and game on all lands in the State of Alaska, including all Federal lands.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980 further, in fact, verified what the Statehood Act did: protecting the right of the State to manage fish and game.

Mo Udall was chairman of the Interior Committee at that time, and he agreed that this was the right thing to do. The thing that we had to do was make sure there was no misinterpretation of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and the Statehood Act.

What occurred under the Obama administration is that—your administration, on that side—in the wee hours of the night, they passed a rule that took that away from the State. And it is huge, if you think about it: 16 refuges, 76.8 million acres. That is bigger than most of the States in this Union. They took the right away from the State to manage fish and game.

There has been a lot of interest groups and some Members of Congress that have been conveying falsehoods, flat out dishonesty on what the taking back of the management of fish and game will do. They talk about killing puppies and grizzly bears. That does not happen, nor, in fact, is it legal in the State of Alaska under our management.

The opposition will claim there was consultation with the State of Alaska. If that is the case, why did Alaska file suit to overturn this rule? There was no consultation.

Yesterday, I met with most of the leaders of the Alaskan Native community that live in this area in the refuges and around the refuges. Not one of them support the rule passed by the Obama administration.

The other side says they are all for helping the American Indians, the first people, yet they are supporting a rule that is illegal. Illegal. I want to stress that.

This rule passed by the Obama administration is opposed by the total delegation, the Governor, all the elected officials in the State of Alaska, and it is an infringement upon the State of Alaska, and it should be an infringement upon your States.

Maybe we ought to go back to every State in the Union, maybe even Virginia, and see how we might change the right of Virginia when the Federal lands were involved in the State of Alaska.

You stood up in front of this body and held your hand and said: I swear to uphold the Constitution of America and laws pertaining to it. Every one of you took that oath. Every one of you. Yet, you stand on this floor, and some of you will say: Oh, we have to protect the wolf puppies. That is not what this is about. It is about the law. It is the Statehood Act, the right of Alaskans, and the right of Alaska to manage all fish and game.

If you vote against this resolution, you are saying the Congress does not count, nor can we keep our word. We will do whatever is popular at the time. I say: Shame on you. You said you would uphold the Constitution.

Let's pass this legislation that Mr. BISHOP has brought to the floor. Let's turn back that illegal law that they are trying to impose upon the people of Alaska and the American people. If you don't believe in that, then I suggest you resign from the body, because you are not upholding the law that you swore you would do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members of this House for their support of the legal aspects of the State of Alaska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed to be part of this discussion of H.J. Res. 69.

Day in and day out, we have meaningful debate in committees and the House floor that reflect very real philosophical differences about the responsibilities and the limits of the Federal Government. These differences and world views inevitably reflect differences in values.

Today, I can't understand how my Republican friends can defend values that allow and promote the cruelest possible killing methods.

Humans have hunted for millennia. This hunting traditionally requires patience, skill, cunning and encourage, but not sugar doughnuts, helicopters, gasses, or leg traps.

Today's House joint resolution would overturn this incredibly fair and reasonable U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service regulation that would rightly prohibit controversial and scientifically justified killing methods on 76 million acres of Federal wildlife refuge lands—76 million acres that belong to the American people.

□ 1245

The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act authorize—and, in fact, require—the Fish and Wildlife Service to maintain the natural diversity of refuges in Alaska, regardless of State wildlife laws. This includes protecting healthy populations of apex predators like wolves and bears.

So this rule would prohibit the inhumane and indiscriminate killing of keystone species in the national wildlife refuges. This does not interfere with fair chase hunting methods. It doesn't even prevent inhumane and indiscriminate killing on State and private lands.

Anyone voting to support this Congressional Review Act resolution today is tacitly supporting using airplanes and helicopters to scout land and shoot grizzly bears, killing wolves, black bears, coyote mothers and their pups and cubs in dens, actually gassing them, and the trapping of grizzly bears and black bears with steel-jawed leg-hold traps and wire snares, where they are trapped, bleeding, frightened, slowly dying of thirst and starvation. Statewide polls show that Alaskans strongly support eliminating these cruel and unsporting practices.

Alaska also gains over \$2 billion in economic activity for wildlife viewing, which is five times what it earns from hunting. This makes economic sense. It is a huge driver of tourism. Many come to Alaska for the unique opportunity to see bears, wolves, and other keystone species. They are the very ones at risk if we pass this resolution.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, to oppose these cruel and

inhumane practices. They are not sporting practices, and they violate any understanding of humane values and respect for nature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his time and his leadership on this issue.

I come to the floor today as the co-chair of the largest bipartisan caucus in the United States Congress: the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. On behalf of the millions of sportsmen and -women around the country, I say to the Federal Government, enough is enough. We will not be intimidated; we will not be strong-armed; and we will not be silent.

States have enjoyed a cooperative relationship with the Federal Government for years on wildlife management, and this is a disturbing shift that we have seen in the last administration.

Though I come to the floor today in defense of Alaska's management rights of national wildlife refuges, this sets a disturbing precedent for the lower 48 States. It is a disturbingly brazen power grab by the Federal Government against the law, in spite of loud and widespread opposition at the local level.

The rule removes Alaska's authority to manage fish and wildlife for both nonsubsistence and subsistence uses in Federal wildlife. The action by the last administration violated the clear letter of the Alaska Statehood Act, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act.

I encourage my colleagues to support what we are doing today and stand in support of the good men and women, the outdoorsmen in the great State of Alaska. I know you have heard from the gentleman from Alaska who has very clearly articulated the position of the people he represents in that great State.

I applaud the chairman. I applaud the action that we are taking today. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, for the third week in a row, Republicans are back on the floor of the House of Representatives seeking to overturn environmental protections for our Nation's deeply valued public lands, this time attacking wildlife protections for iconic species living in national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

This is not a new issue for me or my constituents. My late husband, Senator Paul Tsongas, helped write the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980. He worked on a bipartisan basis with Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska to craft legislation that balanced conservation with responsible

economic development for Alaskans, including oil exploration, mining, timber harvesting, and sport hunting.

But he also stated on the Senate floor, back in 1980: "Nature made the wilderness and wildlife in Alaska majestic during hundreds of thousands of years. Man"—and, I would add, woman—"is challenged merely to respect and preserve that natural majesty."

He also spoke on the Senate floor about conversations at the dinner table with our then 6-year-old daughter, who asked what her father was doing to protect endangered species. Well, our daughter has grown now, but here we are 37 years later in Congress debating if that bipartisan law crafted with my late husband allows hunters to shoot bear cubs and wolf pups in their den on a national wildlife refuge.

My colleagues are correct that ANILCA, as that law is known, and other Federal laws give the State of Alaska unique privileges and responsibilities to oversee wildlife management on public lands; however, this is not a *carte blanche*. There has never been a right to set policies on national wildlife refuges that are inconsistent with bedrock environmental laws or ANILCA's mandate to conserve species and habitats in their natural diversity on wildlife refuges.

I fully support the Fish and Wildlife Service's decision to no longer turn a blind eye to harmful practices that are detrimental to nationally significant species and are not rooted in science-based wildlife management practices.

If my colleagues so desperately want to authorize a right to shoot bears from a helicopter in a wildlife refuge, I would be happy to recommend some video games. I hear virtual reality headsets these days make it just like the real thing. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, today House Republicans are taking a short break from their crusade to make our air and water dirtier so they can now take the time to make it easier to kill bear cubs and wolf pups on our national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

The rule that this resolution seeks to repeal does not infringe upon the State of Alaska's bizarre campaign to destroy wildlife populations on State lands nor does it prohibit the State from conducting scientifically valid predator control measures on refuge lands.

The massive Federal overreach and trampling of states' rights being claimed by the sponsor of this resolution and its supporters is nothing more than the latest statement of alternative facts by Republicans here in Washington. The truth is both the Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act authorize—and, in fact, require—the Fish and Wildlife Service to maintain the natural diversity of refuges in Alaska, regardless of State wildlife laws. This includes protecting healthy populations of apex predators like wolves and bears.

Instead, the rule prevents the use of methods that hunters in our own country agree violate the "fair chase" ethical standard that separates sports hunting from pleasure killing. I don't hunt, but no hunter that I know would ever think of catching a bear in a steel trap or luring it in with bait and then shooting it or blowing away a mother wolf and her pups in their den. These are the types of practices this rule bans, and it only prohibits them on national wildlife refuge areas that are owned and maintained by the American people, not the State of Alaska. These tactics are not part of any science-based wildlife management strategy, and despite what Trump's new Education Secretary might think, these measures are not necessary to protect schoolchildren from grizzlies.

This resolution is just another piece of the Republican agenda to hand our public lands over to States and private interests as well as a distraction from the things House Republicans aren't doing.

Where is your infrastructure package?

Where is your solution to make technical education and college more affordable?

Where is your plan to combat climate change?

The answer is that they do not exist. So, instead, we are wasting time on yet another Congressional Review Act resolution, standing idly by without putting people to work fixing our roads, bridges, and energy grid; without training Americans to do the job of today's economy, not to mention tomorrow's; and without lifting a finger to protect people, many of whom are our own constituents, from the worst impacts of global warming.

The only difference between Trump and the House Republicans is that he distracts the public to try to move his agenda, and they distract the public to hide the fact that they can't move theirs. I urge you to stop the distractions and vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Lands in our full committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in the dying days of the Obama administration, and over vigorous protests by many wildlife and user groups, not to mention the State of Alaska itself, the National Fish and Wildlife Service imposed the rule that Congressman YOUNG's resolution overturns. In violation of the Alaska Statehood Act, the

Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act, the Fish and Wildlife Service removed Alaska's authority to manage the fish and wildlife populations within its own borders on 76 million acres. That is a land area larger than 45 States.

As part of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, the State agreed to several national wildlife refuges within its borders. In exchange for the Federal Government assuming control of these lands, Alaska was given explicit authority to manage its wildlife populations. This new agency rule breaks this promise. It begins a dangerous process of seizing control of fish and game management decisions which have by right, by law, and by custom belonged to the States.

The North American model of wildlife conservation has been a huge success and has sustained healthy wildlife populations for many generations. Not only is the Fish and Wildlife Service rule illegal, it threatens to reverse these successful land management relationships; it places severe restrictions on the public's right to hunt and fish on these public lands; it interferes with the State's success in managing wildlife populations to assure that they don't overrun the ability of the land to support them; and it shreds the cooperative relationship that Alaska and the Federal Government have enjoyed over these lands since Alaskan statehood.

We have three overarching objectives in the Federal Lands Subcommittee: to restore public access to the public lands, to restore sound management to the public lands, and to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities and States impacted by the public lands. In adopting this rule, the agency violated all of these principles.

The Federal Lands Subcommittee will spend this Congress working on legislation to restore our public lands from the policy of benign neglect that has plagued our land management to the point where we are losing entire forests in the West and that has strained the relationships between our communities and our Federal agencies. The resolution sponsored by Congressman YOUNG is an excellent start. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the former ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about what this rule didn't do.

First off, ANILCA did not grant the State of Alaska any additional authority to manage wildlife on Federal lands. This rule is totally compliant with ANILCA. ANILCA actually prioritizes conservation of these species we are talking about here today, apex predators, on more than half the refuges in the State.

As required by ANILCA, the rule ensures that national wildlife refuges—

that is what we are talking about here, wildlife refuges—conserve species and habitats in their natural diversity. That doesn't mean you kill the predators so that people who don't have good hunting skills are going to have an easier time getting a caribou or moose. That is not what this is supposed to be about on the national wildlife refuges. It actually prioritizes conservation of these species.

I just heard that something about this will severely restrict hunting and fishing on these lands. Absolutely not true, unless you say shooting wolves and their pups in the den or gassing them in the den is hunting—and we are restricting that.

Bears and cubs would be killed during hibernation, hunters crawling around killing bears during hibernation. No, hunters don't do that.

Brown and black bears would be trapped, snared using steel-jawed traps, wire snares—again, not hunters, not sportsmen.

Luring and baiting grizzly bears? Wow. Now, that is a real sportsmanlike hunter with a lot of skills kind of guy or woman who has to use bait to kill a grizzly bear.

□ 1300

Aerial gunning of bears by State agency personnel, that is hunters? No, not quite.

Sportsmen? No, don't think so.

And using aircraft to track bears and kill in the same day, those are the things that would be prohibited. That is what is prohibited.

Subsistence hunting? Absolutely no impact.

Fishing? Fish? I guess the fishing thing would be the grizzly bears eat the fish, and people who don't have good fishing skills want to catch the fish. So if we kill the grizzly bears, they won't eat the fish. So it does impact fishing. I guess, sort of, maybe. No, it doesn't.

This is absolutely inhumane, unsportsmanlike, and unnecessary. The State of Alaska is doing this just to decrease the natural balance of predation, which actually creates healthier herds of caribou and healthier moose populations.

There was a study done in 2015 by professors from both Alaska and Washington that showed that actually having these predators present increases the health and the diversity of the herds of caribou, because the sick and the lame and the old get killed, but the rest of them flourish and breed. There would be more than enough still to hunt.

Yeah, maybe you won't be able to drive your pickup truck, stick your rifle out of the away, blast away, and get one. You might actually have to get out of the pickup truck. You might actually have to have some hunting skills and track a little bit to get the caribou or the moose.

But if we kill off all of the grizzlies and the wolves, it will be a lot easier. They will overpopulate. Actually, what

they will do is they will start going down at the riparian areas, like happened—it is a different ecosystem—in Yellowstone, and then the streams will not be as plentiful with fish.

This is about natural balance, it is about Federal lands, it is about sportsmen and women, and it is about prohibiting the State of Alaska from using its extreme predator control methods. That is what this is called: extreme predator control methods. That is all it prevents.

This is a very sad day in this House if this resolution passes, and it is long-term bad for Alaska.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the vice chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 69, a bill to use the Congressional Review Act to repeal a rule issued by the Fish and Wildlife Service to restrict hunting within national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

I would like to commend Congressman YOUNG for his leadership on crafting this legislation and for defending his constituents' right to manage the wildlife in their home State.

Mr. Speaker, the assertion that the repeal of this rule would allow unethical management and hunting practices is utterly false. Alaskans have hunted and managed their land for generations, and this overreach by the Fish and Wildlife Service simply impedes their ability to do just that.

Allow me to read from the 2016–2017 Alaska Trapping Regulations, one of many sound management documents usurped by this bureaucratic overreach:

“Wolves and bears are very effective and efficient predators of caribou, moose, deer, and other wildlife. In most of Alaska, humans also rely on the same species for food. In Alaska's Interior, predators kill more than 80 percent of the moose and caribou that die during an average year, while humans kill less than 10 percent. In most of the state, predation holds prey populations at levels far below what could be supported by the habitat in the area. Predation is an important part of the ecosystem, and all . . . wolf management programs, including control programs, are designed to sustain wolf populations in the future.”

Additionally, the regulations go on to say:

“You may not: disturb or destroy beaver houses or any furbearer den.” Such as wolves, coyote, or mink.

Mr. Speaker, the claim that this bill will allow Alaskans to hunt wolves in their dens is simply false rhetoric, designed to mislead the public, while bureaucrats take away the rights of Alaskans. The people of Alaska rely on these lands to provide for their families, and this Fish and Wildlife rule attempts to insert Washington bureaucrats into that process.

Mr. Speaker, I cringe to think about U.S. Fish and Wildlife usurping established law. I cringe to think about U.S. Fish and Wildlife legislating themselves more power through the rule-making process. I cringe to think about U.S. Fish and Wildlife expanding the regulations in Alaska, and I sure as heck don't want them expanding them in Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a slippery slope, and I urge my colleagues to rescind this overreach and support this resolution.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, a quick response to the notion that the fears of inhumane practices are utterly false. In a Los Angeles Times story in 2012, the headline is: "Alaska officials expand aerial shooting of bears."

It goes on to say:

"The controversial 'intensive management' moves are the latest in a series of increasingly aggressive control methods targeting bears and wolves in Alaska. In some areas, wolf pups can be gassed in their dens, bear cubs and sows can be hunted, and wolves shot from helicopters."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we really should be calling this bill the "Puppy Killing Act."

This resolution would overturn a rule that prohibits some of the cruelest hunting practices on Federal lands in Alaska. Now, again, this is not on State land. This is on Federal land that Colorado taxpayers and taxpayers across the country pay for the maintenance of and that we, the people of the country, own.

The Fish and Wildlife rule prohibits so-called predator control activities that Alaska has made legal in State law. As Mr. HUFFMAN said, the Alaska Board of Game specifically voted to allow aerial gunning and snaring of bears. They have engaged in gassing of wolf pups in their dens. These are not theoretical matters. They are actual matters as to why this rule is so important and why I oppose it being overturned.

If this bill passes, the activities that are prevented under this rule for refuges can actually occur.

These cruel and inhumane methods that Alaska wishes to implement, including killing wolf pups and their mothers at or near their dens, killing brown bears with the use of steel-jawed traps, and scouting and shooting grizzly bears from planes and helicopters, are not only unsportsmanlike, but run counter to the directives of the National Wildlife Refuge System and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Thirty-one scientists submitted their support for the Alaska National Refuge Act, noting that the best available science indicates that widespread elimination of bears, coyotes, and wolves will quite unlikely make ungulate herds magically reappear. So, again, the science is clear on this matter.

There was another study by the 1997 National Academy of Sciences that found that Alaska's predator control system, including the assertion of killing wolves and bears, somehow makes other wildlife populations healthier is simply not supported by sound science.

This blunt and unscientific and inhumane approach to managing apex predators and carnivores employed by the State of Alaska is actually counter to the law and the congressional mandate regarding the National Wildlife Refuge System.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which passed overwhelmingly in this body, says it requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to:

Conserve Fish and Wildlife populations and their habitats in their natural diversity.

How does it protect our carnivore species and the species they consume in their natural diversity if there is artificial and inhumane human intervention to kill puppies and target bears from aircraft?

It is simply unscientific, inhumane, and wrong.

In direct contrast to Federal law, Alaska has adopted regulations that require the killing of wolves and bears under so-called predation control efforts to artificially inflate game populations frequently above and beyond the carrying capacity of the land. The State currently authorizes extreme practices like aerial shooting of wolves or bears by State agency personnel, trapping of wolves by paid contractors, and using airplanes to hunt wolves and bears.

Not only is this bill inhumane and counter to our stewardship of the National Wildlife Refuge, but it is also counterproductive for jobs in the economy of Alaska. Wildlife watching provides roughly five times more the revenue to the Alaskan economy than hunting or trapping. It turns out that the American people and tourists around the world would rather see these puppies and photograph them rather than shoot them and gas them.

According to the Fish and Wildlife records, wildlife viewing activities in Alaska support over \$2 billion in economic activity.

Why is Congress spending time trying to allow puppy killing and cruel hunting methods to occur, instead of fair chase methods, especially when this actually undermines Alaska's economy and their ecology of Federal refuges?

Why are we repealing this rule when, in fact, most Alaskans support it?

The American people know there are more pressing issues facing the country than this rule. I urge Members to join me and vote "no" on the CRA and protecting puppies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BEYER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. POLIS. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting with the Alaskan people, with the economic interests of

Alaska, and with the taxpayers of America, who are stewards of this land, for better wildlife management practices, to stop killing puppies, and engage in inhumane trapping and hunting practices of bears.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), a member of our committee, who is also going to talk about the reality of what we are facing here.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 2016, the Obama administration published another overreaching regulation that threatens the authority of States nationwide to manage fish and wildlife.

Specifically, the new rule undermines Alaska's authority to manage fish and wildlife on State, private, and Federal lands. The new regulation destroys the cooperative relationship between the State of Alaska and the agency that historically worked well.

This power grab threatens management policies and wildlife refuges nationwide and, if allowed to stand, will set a dangerous precedent for future top-down mandates from the Federal Government that seize authority from States.

The rule violates the Alaska constitution and two laws that were passed by Congress in the form of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and the Alaska Statehood Act. People throughout the country oppose this misguided rule that harms the State of Alaska's authority to manage fish and wildlife within its borders.

In my home State of Arizona, 21 different sportsmen's groups have come out publicly against the rule and endorsed Representative YOUNG's bill to overturn this Washington power grab. The 21 Arizona sportsmen's groups include:

Anglers United; Arizona Flycasters; Arizona Sportsmen for Wildlife Conservation; Arizona Antelope Foundation, Arizona B.A.S.S. Nation; Arizona Big Game Super Raffle; Arizona Bowhunters Association; Arizona Catfish Conservation Association; Arizona Chapter of National Wild Turkey Federation; Arizona Council of Trout Unlimited; Arizona Deer Association; Arizona Desert Bighorn Sheep Society; Arizona Elk Society; Arizona Houndsmen Association; Arizona Outdoor Sports; Coconino Sportsmen; Outdoor Experience for All; Shake Rattle and Troll Outdoors; the Bass Federation-AZ; Xtreme Predator Callers; and 1.2.3.Go.

Representative DON YOUNG's bill is also supported by 27 different sportsmen and conservation groups throughout the country. The National Rifle Association, who is key voting in support of Representative YOUNG's bill, stated:

The sustainable management of these natural resources needs to be led by the State working in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Fish and Wildlife Service's final rule would set an ill-advised national precedent that could have far-reaching negative implications on the lower 48

States. H.J. Res. 69 will restore the jurisdictional State-Federal relationship as Congress has previously directed.

Americans for Prosperity, who is also key voting in support of H.J. Res. 69, stated:

The Interior rule relating to nonsubsistence take of wildlife, and public participation of closure procedures on national wildlife refuges in Alaska undermines the ability of Alaskans to manage fish and wildlife on refuge lands, which make up more than 20 percent of the State.

Instead, Congress should work with the Trump administration to ensure cooperative Federalism and greater public participation over fish and wildlife management decisions.

I share these concerns and urge rejection of this Obama power grab that undermines Alaska authority to manage fish and wildlife on State, private, and Federal lands. I applaud Representative DON YOUNG for his excellent work and leadership on this issue. He has been remarkably successful over the years of protecting the interests of the people of the State of Alaska. This is yet another classic example of the bureaucratic overreach that Representative YOUNG is working hard to overturn.

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game knows best how to manage fish and wildlife in the State of Alaska, not Washington bureaucrats.

I urge adoption of Representative YOUNG's commonsense bill.

□ 1315

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues and my fellow Americans can see what is even greater about this country in its far-reaching wildlife and open areas.

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 69 because I do think it is important that we be good custodians of what has been given to us. Yes, to protect those humans who have come to be in places where wildlife was, but to be good custodians.

The rule that was adopted years ago after public engagement from many different people is reasonable and rational:

Denning of wolves and their pups, shooting or trapping them while at their dens in the spring; using airplanes to scout land and shoot grizzly bears; trapping of grizzly bears and black bears with steel-jawed leghold traps and wire snares—this is what that rule prevents—luring grizzly bears with rotting meat, sugar, and pet food to get a point-blank kill; denning of black bear mothers and cubs during hibernation.

It reminds me of the time that I came to the floor last year to stand against a horrible killing of Cecil the lion by someone who wanted a trophy.

So let me tell you about the lesson from Dr. Ed Schmitt, a retired surgeon, a hunter, who moved to Alaska from Colorado to fish in the river that flowed by his house, to be able to hunt.

He enjoyed fishing for salmon, casting for salmon, and seeing the brown bears, also known as grizzly bears. Here is what he said:

"Most of us that live in Alaska are here because we recognize that it has something that the rest of the world doesn't," says Mr. Schmitt, president of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, which is working with the HSUS to protect animals from trophy hunting abuses. "The wildness can be destroyed by people. We've stopped seeing the wildlife because we've made it go away."

He further said: "It's not true that all Alaskans are OK with the state running rampant on public lands."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. "It's not true that all Alaskans are OK with the state running rampant on public lands," he says. "Only a minority of Alaskans are hunters, and even fewer kill animals just for a trophy."

This is Dr. Schmitt, a hunter. This is not a tree hugger. He is a hunter who moved to this beautiful land that we can call America. So many Americans on the mainland, in essence, go to this beautiful, connected Alaska, and so Dr. Schmitt goes on to say, like most hunters in Alaska, he is appalled at practices that have been raised up to not save the beauty of these wild animals. "The notion that people don't want any rules is a myth. We want good rules, just like everybody else."

Well, I want to stand alongside of Dr. Ed Schmitt, a healer, a former doctor, a hunter who moved to Alaska, who understands that what we are seeking to disapprove is wrong because it was a reasoned response to all who were engaged in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 69, a congressional resolution rescinding a final rule promulgated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to prevent widely criminalized, cruel, and unsporting hunting methods of killing wolves, grizzly bears, and other native mammals on 76 million acres of federal lands in Alaska.

I oppose the disapproval resolution because it subverts the judgment of professional wildlife managers, and allows appalling methods of killing animals on public lands designated for wildlife.

The FWS rule does not apply to subsistence hunting or sport hunting in general; it simply restricts methods of killing that are not suited anywhere, least of all on national wildlife refuges.

The rule, adopted after years of public engagement and with the support of many Alaskans, bans the following practices:

1. Denning of wolves and their pups—shooting or trapping them while at their dens in the spring;
2. Using airplanes to scout, land and shoot grizzly bears;
3. Trapping of grizzly bears and black bears with steel-jawed leg hold traps and wire snares;
4. Luring grizzly bears with rotting meat, sugar, and pet food to get a point blank kill; and

5. Denning of black bear mothers and cubs during hibernation.

H.J. Res. 69, if adopted, would prevent the Administration from ever issuing a rule on this topic, foreclosing our Federal wildlife managers from regulating these activities in any way under current law.

The decision to ban these cruel hunting practices came directly from professional wildlife managers from the FWS based in Alaska and is consistent with science-based wildlife management practices.

In addition, the FWS statutory mandate requires that the agency conserve wildlife species.

The FWS appealed to the Alaska Board of Game dozens of times to amend its rules to ensure that the FWS statutory mandate was being followed.

The Board of Game's continued refusal to do so forced FWS to initiate this rulemaking to ensure that its statutory mandate of conserving wildlife species on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska is followed.

Mr. Speaker, a statewide poll conducted in February 2016 showed Alaskans opposed denning of wolves by more than a 2-to-1 margin.

The poll showed that Alaska voters strongly support eliminating these cruel and unsporting methods of killing native carnivores on National Wildlife Refuges in their state.

Additionally, at a series of public meetings on the rule, many Alaskans turned out to publicly support the rule because they want these inhumane, unsustainable, unsporting practices to end.

Mr. Speaker, another reason to oppose H.J. Res. 69 is that it would damage wildlife tourism and hurt the economy of Alaska.

These are federal lands, maintained with federal taxpayer dollars, and millions of Americans travel to Alaska each year for the unique opportunity to see bears, wolves, caribou, lynx, and other species on these lands.

Wildlife watchers contribute over \$2 billion to the economy of Alaska—five times more than the amount generated in Alaska from hunting activity.

The wildlife within our National Wildlife Refuges is a national resource and Americans across the country care about protecting it for future generations of Americans.

For these reasons, I strongly opposed H.J. Res. 69, and urge my colleagues to join me.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this disapproval and to support and stand with these beautiful animals.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article, "The Fight to Protect Alaska's Predators," and an article regarding Safari Club.

[The Humane Society of the United States, Oct. 19, 2016]

THE FIGHT TO PROTECT ALASKA'S PREDATORS
(By Karen E. Lange)

Ed Schmitt, a retired surgeon, moved to Alaska to experience the wild. He left Colorado for the Kenai Peninsula, south of Anchorage, where he could fish in a river that flowed right outside his house and hunt, he says, in a way that respects wildlife and the environment. Schmitt enjoyed casting for salmon and seeing brown bears, also known as grizzly bears, fishing nearby.

He never wanted to kill them. But over 25 years, development and new roads ate away bear habitat. And a different mentality from Schmitt's, one that treats large predators as

creatures to be eliminated so populations of moose and caribou can flourish, took its toll on the Kenai's brown bears. Schmitt hasn't seen one in three years.

"Most of us that live in Alaska are here because we recognized that it has something that the rest of the world doesn't," says Schmitt, president of the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, which is working with The HSUS to protect animals from trophy hunting abuses. "The wildness can be destroyed by people. We've stopped seeing the wildlife because we've made it go away." A U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service rule released in August aims to preserve the state's biodiversity by banning cruel and unsporting hunting methods on the 76 million acres of Alaska's federal national wildlife refuges. (Last year, the National Park Service issued a similar rule for the more than 20 million acres of federal preserves within the state). Under the rule, supported by The HSUS and a network of scientists and local advocacy groups, hunters will no longer be able to bait brown bears, trap brown or black bears or use a plane to find bears from the air and then immediately land and shoot them. In addition, trophy hunters will not be allowed to kill black bear mothers and cubs or wolf and coyote mothers and pups in their dens (subsistence hunters are exempt). And "predator control" programs, which let hunters kill greater numbers of carnivores in the hope the populations of prey animals such as caribou will increase, won't be permitted in national wildlife refuges.

"This is the first time the federal government has stood up to the state of Alaska's brutal practices in 37 years," says Wendy Keefover, HSUS native carnivore protection manager, who led meetings on the rule in Anchorage, Juneau and Fairbanks to encourage constituents to speak out.

An HSUS poll in March showed a majority of Alaskans support these restrictions, and the Fish and Wildlife Service says most people who submitted comments favored the rule. The change came despite well-financed campaigns by the NRA and Safari Club International against it, and the opposition of the hunters, trappers and hunting guides on the state's Board of Game, as well as Alaska's representatives in Congress.

HSUS Alaska state director Michael Haukedalen says the number of residents who rallied to support the rule shows there's a constituency for reform. "It's not true that all Alaskans are OK with the state running rampant on public lands," he says. "Only a minority of Alaskans are hunters, and even fewer kill animals just for a trophy."

In the 1980s and 1990s, citizen ballot initiatives passed bans on cruel and unsporting hunting practices. However, these were later overridden by the state legislature and governor. In 1994, the legislature enacted a law requiring the state's Department of Fish and Game to practice "intensive management" of predators if caribou, moose and deer populations dropped below certain levels.

For 10 years federal officials tried to negotiate with the Alaska Board of Game to protect wolves and bears from egregious hunting practices, says biologist Francis Mauer, retired from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

"It's this ever-increasing fervor to kill predators in Alaska," he says. "The federal agencies realized these hunting practices are inconsistent with the purpose for which the parks and reserves were established, and they had a responsibility to act."

The fight against hunting abuses has now shifted to Washington, D.C., where Rep. Don Young (R-AK) got riders into House appropriations and energy bills that would undo both the Fish and Wildlife and National Park Service rules. Similar language was slipped

into a Senate appropriations bill. The HSUS and other groups are encouraging Congress to reject these riders before sending the bills to the president.

Schmitt says he, like most hunters in Alaska, is appalled by the practices the Fish and Wildlife Service has banned. "The notion that people don't want any rules is a myth. We want good rules, just like everybody else."

[From the Clarion, Feb. 9, 2017]

SAFARI CLUB SUES OVER NATIONAL PARK, WILDLIFE REFUGE REGULATIONS

(By Elizabeth Earl)

The Safari Club International has filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service over its hunting rules on federal lands in Alaska.

The nonprofit, one of the largest hunting advocacy organizations in the country, is challenging a set of rules the three organizations enacted in 2016 to restrict hunting and trapping practices on national preserves and on national wildlife refuges in the state, specifically on the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. The rules conflict with the state's ability to manage wildlife and interfere with Alaskans' ability to hunt and trap, among other impacts, according to the lawsuit filed Jan. 19 in U.S. District Court for Alaska.

The federal government owns more than half of Alaska, managed by a smattering of different federal agencies. The U.S. Department of the Interior manages national wildlife refuges through the Fish and Wildlife Service and national parks and preserves through the National Park Service. Taken together, NPS manages about 54 million acres of the state, and Fish and Wildlife manages about 76.7 million acres.

Specifically, the lawsuit takes issue with a rule that bans predator control activities on national wildlife refuges "unless based on sound science and in response to a conservation concern or is necessary to meet refuge purposes, federal laws or (Fish and Wildlife Service) policy," according to an Aug. 3, 2016 press release about the rule.

The National Park Service's rule, which was finalized Oct. 23, 2015, prohibits the taking of brown bears over bait and the take of wolves and coyotes between May 1 and Aug. 9, which is designated as denning season, and eliminating the "temporary" closure category for national preserves in Alaska, which previously expired after 12 months. The lawsuit claims these closures allow Alaska personnel "unlimited discretion" to close areas to sport hunting without providing rulemaking notice or public comment opportunities.

The lawsuit also claims the consequences of the National Park Service's actions extend beyond its boundaries because the predators and prey do not remain within the boundaries of the national preserves.

"The NPS exceeded its statutory authority in promulgating the NPS Regulations, as the regulations illegally override the State's authority to regulate the methods and means of taking Alaska's wildlife," the lawsuit states.

The complaint against Fish and Wildlife's general rule prohibiting predator control activities on Alaska national wildlife refuges is for similar reasons. On the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge specifically, which covers a broad swath of the Kenai Peninsula between the Russian River and the community of Sterling and stretches down toward the Fox River Flats on the southern peninsula, the lawsuit objects to the public use restrictions that prohibit some plane and motorboat use and lynx, coyote and wolf hunting within the Skilak Wildlife Recreation Area and prohibit

bear baiting for brown bears, require a permit for baiting black bears and prohibit using a dog to hunt big game except for black bears, with a special use permit, among other rules.

The lawsuit claims that neither the National Park Service nor Fish and Wildlife completed the proper National Environmental Protection Act processes for their regulations.

The lawsuit asks for the court to declare all the regulations as invalid and enjoin the agencies from enacting the regulations.

The suit was filed less than a week after the State of Alaska filed its own lawsuit against the same rules. The state's suit claims very similar grievances against the rules, saying it breaches the state's ability to manage its wildlife effectively, according to a news release from Gov. Bill Walker's website.

The Safari Club International supports the state's lawsuit but chose to file its own anyway, said Safari Club International President Larry Higgins in a statement. The Safari Club's lawsuit focuses more specifically on the rights of nonsubsistence users than the state's lawsuit and contains complaints specific to the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge rules, which the state's lawsuit does not, he said.

"Safari Club concluded it was necessary to file its own lawsuit to represent and protect fully the interests of its members and others who hunt in Alaska for subsistence and/or for nonsubsistence purposes," he said. "Both lawsuits challenge regulations adopted by the Obama Administration that prohibit certain hunting methods on National Preserves and National Wildlife Refuges."

The main issue the group has with the rules is state wildlife management, said Eddie Grasser, the vice president of the Safari Club's Alaska chapter. All successful wildlife management in the U.S. is based on state management, he said.

"The main emphasis for our part, anyway, is the issue of state management," he said. "We don't feel the federal government has the authority to manage wildlife because of the way the system has evolved over time."

Higgins said in his statement that the club will support the state's legal efforts as well.

"To the extent possible, Safari Club will work cooperatively with the State, and others who may decide to challenge the regulations, to present the best arguments to the court," he said.

The National Park Service had no comment on the Safari Club's lawsuit and the Fish and Wildlife Service did not respond to a request for comment Thursday.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the assertion that removing this rule would allow for egregious, cruel, and unsporting hunting methods is just totally false. The people of Alaska, I trust them to manage the game of that State. The idea, the accusation that this rule allows for shooting of wolf pups in their den is totally false. Disturbing wolf dens for any reason—hunting, trapping, or for wildlife management—is illegal in the State of Alaska.

The 2016-2017 Alaska Trapping Regulations state:

The following methods are illegal for taking furbearers: You may not disturb or destroy beaver houses or any furbearer den.

Again, the people of Alaska can be trusted to manage their game.

Additionally, the claim that removing this rule would allow for the use of airplanes or helicopters to hunt is totally false. Using aircraft is illegal in the State of Alaska. The 2016–2017 Alaska Hunting Regulations state:

You may not take game by driving, herding, harassing, or molesting game with any motorized vehicle such as an aircraft, airboat, snow machine, motorboat, et cetera.

Finally, the claim that removing this rule would allow for trapping of grizzly bears and black bears with steel-jawed leghold traps, again, simply totally false. Trapping or snaring big game is illegal in the State of Alaska.

The 2016–2017 Alaska Hunting Regulations state:

You may not take game by using a trap or a snare to take big game, fur animals, or small game.

As you can see, these claims are nothing but false rhetoric from antisportsmen that think they know better how to manage Alaska's wildlife than the good people of Alaska do. Alaska law already precludes these practices, yet they are being used as an emotional argument to hide what is clearly a bureaucratic overreach which unfairly targets the citizens of Alaska.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I appreciate his leadership on this.

I just heard my friend talk about these imaginary practices. If they are, in fact, imaginary, what is the problem in terms of having Fish and Wildlife moving to bring hunting standards in Federal lands in Alaska more in line with standards for other Federal lands across America?

The fact is that these practices can, in fact, occur, and it is the judgment of the professionals in this field that developed this proposal for the Fish and Wildlife Service. These are the people who are charged with understanding the dynamics, who understand the interaction, based on sound science going forward. The majority of people in Alaska do not support such practices. These are basically the rules that the rest of America deals with in terms of our wildlife refuges.

I spent a lot of time working in the area of animal welfare. It is something that I find is one of those rare areas in Congress where there is far more agreement than disagreement. We find, across the country, 25,000 organizations that are dedicated to animal welfare. This is an area that I am sad to see we are breaking down now with, I think, unnecessary controversy.

Being able to deal with wildlife management and protection, being able to deal with humane hunting practices, to be able to allow the professionals in the Fish and Wildlife Service and elsewhere to be able to help in developing uniform standards is something that should not be unnecessarily divisive. I am hopeful that we give the Fish and Wildlife Service the authority and re-

sponsibility to manage these refuges and that we respect the fact that they took public input into account; they weighed the comments; they put forward a thoughtful rule.

Being able to nullify this rule entirely, return to some of the most inhumane practices, is simply inappropriate. Instead of rolling back these rules, we should respect the agency's expertise, the wishes of the vast majority of the people we represent, and uniform provisions to apply to all wildlife refuges.

I am really disappointed that the rhetoric reaches this level and that we are rushing ahead with making changes like this without providing the foundation that would normally occur in the legislative process. This rule is a culmination of a great deal of time and energy, public input, scientific expertise, and hard work. To overturn it summarily, as this Congress has been doing in other areas, I think is a step backwards. It is something that is not supported by the public, and I think it is something that we ought to strongly reject.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, one quick point is that these national wildlife refuges are U.S. public lands paid for by U.S. taxpayers and should be managed for the benefit of all. So let me quote former Fish and Wildlife Service Director Dan Ashe, recently departed, who said these "are not game farms managed for a slice of their diversity for the benefit of a few people who would call themselves hunters."

Much has been made in this debate this afternoon, Madam Speaker, about whether ANILCA prohibits this Fish and Wildlife rule. We have gone back and forth with different cases. Let me just quote a few key paragraphs.

Section 302 and 303 of ANILCA establishes 16 national wildlife refuges, and for each one, the purpose is stated for which the refuge is to be established and shall be managed, including: "to conserve fish and wildlife populations in their natural diversity."

The law doesn't say wildlife should be managed in some alternate state of unnatural diversity where no wolves, no bears, and overpopulated moose herds can destroy the landscape.

Both the ANILCA, and the Improvement Act, the 1998 law that reorganized the National Wildlife Refuge System, managed Alaska's Federal refuge managers to conserve natural diversity, a value that the Fish and Wildlife Services correctly noted is incompatible with indiscriminate predator culls.

Every Federal court to consider the question, including the Ninth Circuit, which contains Alaska, has held the States lack the authority to overrule Fish and Wildlife Service management decisions concerning Federal refuge management. So this has already been before the courts. The courts, I believe, have already decided.

Madam Speaker, in the few minutes I have left, let me just quote a few of the letters we received from Alaska residents in opposition to the resolution before us.

Elizabeth Figus, from Juneau, writes: "I am an Alaskan. I hunt and fish, and I support regulations that prohibit cruel killing. This rule would rightly prohibit controversial and scientifically unjustified killing methods on over 76 million acres of Federal lands in Alaska."

"A hunter who cannot comply with humane methods of the trade/sport is simply lazy and undeserving of the right to harvest the flesh of another living thing."

"This is the 21st century, not the 1800s. We must carry out our hunting in a careful and organized fashion to ensure the safety of Alaskan residents as well as the sustainability of the wild animal resources into the future."

This from Elisabeth Moorehead from Eagle River: "My husband and I owned and operated a successful wildlife tourism business in Alaska for 27 years. The business still continues in the capable hands of one of our guides. . . . I am writing to convey my displeasure over the content of the joint resolution you recently introduced in response to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regulations that ban cruel and unsporting methods of killing bears, wolves and coyotes on Federal wildlife refuges in Alaska."

And from Fran Mauer in Fairbanks: "Over the last 15 years I have watched the state hunting regulations for wolves and bears get progressively more extreme. These methods go far beyond any common sense, are not supported by science, and have no place in our Alaskan National Wildlife Refuges. This is the result of the special interest lobby of extreme pro-hunting groups. . . . I for one, and many other Alaskan hunters, do not want to see the State of Alaska turn our National Wildlife Refuges into game farms."

And, finally, from Jeff Fair from Palmer: "I write you as a 23-year Alaskan wildlife biologist . . . Currently 64 years of age, I hunt and fish and enjoy a permanent license to do so in The Great Land."

"As a biologist, I recognize that predator control does not work in the long run to stabilize or maximize cervid populations. I also recognize that an attempt to repeal U.S. Fish and Wildlife regs on these lands would be an attempt to circumvent, contradict, overturn, or simply break the Federal law that establishes the Fish and Wildlife Service's mission and authority for these lands. And as a hunter I fear for the reputation of the hunting tradition, including conservation and fair-chase, when some service anti-predator techniques are allowed anywhere, including on federal lands."

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman

from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the one who actually lives there and knows the area and knows the names of the towns.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, under the decorum of the House, I won't call it bull. I will just say it is a lot of misinformation and outright story tales, the information conveyed to these gentlemen and the ladies from The Humane Society. That is what it is.

There is no sport hunter who is going to be shooting cubs and sows. In fact, there is no one in the State who does not support my resolution of organized hunters, viewers. I have not had any of that.

Yes, you got some letters. And I believe the best way to judge is, if they don't like what I am doing, don't elect me. I am speaking for the people from my State, not Virginia, not a used car salesman. I am speaking for my people.

The second false claim is it allows aerial shooting and gunning of bears. That is not what this is about. It is about the law, and we will win it in court. But I don't want to win it in court. I want to establish the fact that an agency does not have the right to break the law.

As far as Dan Ashe goes, well, did he have any specialists? No. He did this because of interest groups, governing by interest groups, not the hunters, not the Alaskans, not the gunmen of Alaska, but The Humane Society that put out all of this propaganda.

Denning of wolves—and, by the way, I have to remind people. We used to den wolves. I have done it myself. I got paid 50 bucks for every wolf I got. You know who paid me? Uncle Sam did when we were a territory. And when we became a State, we did not allow that.

So let us do our job as a State, instead of having this Congress try to stop it with an agency.

So I am asking my colleagues to vote for the law, as you should uphold as you took your oath for this office, the law.

And if you continue this misinformation, I feel sorry for you, and I feel sorry for the interest groups.

So, Madam Speaker, I do urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The gentleman is reminded to address the Chair.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, just in mild response, I am, I believe, heartened to know—that may be the wrong verb—but, at least, respect my friend and colleague from Alaska's notion or assertion that these terrible, inhumane hunting practices, which we have talked about for the last hour—whether it is gassing wolves in the den or shooting bears from the helicopter or using bait for the bears or many of the iron leg traps—that all these things do not occur in Alaska on the wildlife refuges; that they are illegal in Alaska. If that is so, that is an excellent thing.

I wonder why the need for the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the Fish and Wildlife regula-

tions if none of these are, in fact, happening.

In any case, there is still a legitimate debate about whether the Fish and Wildlife regulation contravenes ANILCA and the state establishment act. Hopefully, this doesn't have to go to court in order to do that, but I think there seems to be enough judicial precedent that if it did go to court, the Fish and Wildlife regulations would be upheld.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we are here to repeal a rule issued by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service to restrict hunting on the national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

This rule is a solution. The only problem is no one knows for what it is a solution because there is no problem. And the sad part is that means that this rule is basically a useless rule. It has no efficacy to it. Despite the assertions that had been made repeatedly and a cacophony of all sorts of practices that are seeming to be wrong and bad, this rule doesn't do that.

This rule does not abandon any of the practices you are talking about on subsistence hunting, only on nonsubsistence hunting, which simply means that, if you are classified as a subsistence hunter, anything that the other side talked about and raled about is actually allowed by the silly rule. That is why the rule makes no sense.

The State of Alaska had it under control, and there is no real problem that is solved by this rule that is totally inefficient, but did make something nice about it.

Now, it makes things worse because it is talking about predator control only on nonsubsistence hunting. Unfortunately, the predators don't know, when they go after their prey, whether that prey is designed for a subsistence hunter or a recreation hunter. They haven't learned to distinguish that yet.

Ergo, how you administer this law is totally ineffective. It is impossible to do so, and what you do is simply make a blanket approach so that everyone gets harmed in the same equal fashion. That is what Fish and Wildlife has decided to do.

In addition to that, yes, it is illegal. It usurps State authority, and it usurps it very clearly. You know, it is amazing to me. I cannot believe that in the first Congress that we had, the Founding Fathers were there coming up with the Bill of Rights and the 10th Amendment, they thought the 10th Amendment would eventually some day be imagined by a bureaucrat in Washington to overrule Congress on matters that were clearly intended for State discretion, but that is precisely what we have done here.

This rule violates three congressionally passed statutes that have precedence on this particular issue. And this rule violates Federal law passed by Congress on three separate occasions.

What was supposed to be envisioned with this system was a cooperative relationship between the State and the Federal Government. What this rule simply does is allow for Fish and Wildlife on the Federal level to have supremacy, to destroy that cooperation and coordination and take over control totally. That is wrong. It should never be there.

There are 16 different refuges up there. That is 76 million acres of land now going to be controlled by the Fish and Wildlife system here in Washington. That is more acreage than 46 of the 50 States that we have. And, once again, for many of those people, this hunting is a source of subsistence up there.

Here is the bottom line: Mr. BLUMENAUER came up here and said, why don't we let the professionals make their decisions. They do. Those professionals are the Alaska Department of Fish and Game who know exactly what they are doing, they know the area, and they know the animals.

The so-called helicopter hunting that was raled against up here is not done by any recreational hunter. Alaska doesn't allow that. The Alaska Fish and Game will do that for management control based on scientific purposes and reasons and that only.

This rule doesn't change any of that. No. I'm sorry, this rule actually doesn't change any of the recreational hunting, which is already outlawed by the State of Alaska. It only stops the Fish and Wildlife system of Alaska from simply doing their job as they know how to do it.

I include in the RECORD a letter supported by 27 different organizations all dealing with outdoor life in support of this particular resolution.

FEBRUARY 6, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN, Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER MCCARTHY: We write representing organizations that collectively include millions of wildlife conservationists, hunter conservationists, wildlife enthusiasts, and wildlife scientists, in strong support of H.J. Res. 49 from Cong. Young (AK), which would nullify the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (FWS) final rule "Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska" (81 Fed. Reg. 52248 (August 5, 2016)). Our community exhausted all Executive Branch appeals and remedies urging the FWS to slow down the Proposed Rule, and revise it to reflect a proposal mutually agreed to by the State of Alaska and the FWS; all to no end. It is time for Congress to nullify this final rule.

This final rule boldly preempts the authority of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to manage wildlife for both recreational and subsistence hunting on NWRs, which authority of the state is affirmed by Congress in the Alaska Statehood Act, the Alaska National Interests Land Conservation Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act. The FWS final rule was premised on meeting as a priority the FWS policy on Biological Integrity, Diversity and Environmental Health; which

would inadvisably set a precedent nationally. Many members of our organizations enjoy Alaska's bounty of fish and wildlife resources and their habitats for unrivaled hunting, fishing and outdoor experiences. The sustainable management of these natural resources needs to be led by the State working in cooperation with the FWS. We urge that you favorably consider H.J. Res. 49 which will restore the jurisdictional state-federal relationship as Congress has previously directed.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our concerns about this harmful and illegal rule which if left un-remedied, significantly affects the use and appreciation of the magnificent natural resources found in Alaska.

Sincerely,

Archery Trade Association, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Council to Advance Hunting and the Shooting Sports, Dallas Safari Club, Delta Waterfowl Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Houston Safari Club, Masters of Foxhounds Association, Mule Deer Foundation, National Rifle Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Trappers Association, National Wild Turkey Federation, Orion the Hunter's Institute.

Pheasants Forever, Professional Outfitters and Guides, Quail Forever, Quality Deer Management Association, Ruffed Grouse Society, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Safari Club International, Sportsmen's Alliance, Whitetails Unlimited, Wild Sheep Foundation, Wildlife Forever, Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, this comes from groups all over the Nation who understand what is going on and also realize the problem of this—I mean, there are some people who might think this only deals with Alaska. Technically, it does.

The problem is, if this happens to Alaska, if the ability of the Federal Government to supersede the State happens in Alaska, this could also happen to anyone of the lower 48 States.

We are simply one lawsuit away from Fish and Wildlife Service being either allowed or required to order similar regulations for everything across the lower 48 States as well. And that is what is so difficult and impossible to understand.

Look, let me try and sum it up this way: None of the practices that have been railed about today actually are existing, and any of those that are are easily controlled by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

The underlying premise, both of the rule that the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior did and the underlying premise of most of the debate that has happened here on the floor, is that only somebody who lives here in Washington has the intelligence, the foresight, the vision to make these kind of rules that unfortunately people in Alaska are simply too dumb to do it. You are a bunch of red-neck hicks that don't understand how to rule yourself. You don't understand science. You barely have television.

I don't know what it is, but why do we have this mindset that only Washington can make these decisions when actually the States have proven, not only that are they capable, they are su-

perior to what happens from this Department here in Washington.

That is what this is about, an illegal rule that simply takes away from the States what they are doing and what they are doing well; and that is why this should be opposed. That is why this rule should be pulled away. This midnight rule, once again, should be taken back.

Allow them to start over and do something intelligently. At least, recognize the professionals—the real professionals who work in the States to make this system work. They can do it. They have done it. Allow them to do their jobs, and protect the rest of us from any judge saying, oh, if it happened in Alaska, maybe it can happen in your State as well. That is the fear.

This is a rule passed by Fish and Wildlife at the last minute of the Obama administration that doesn't solve anything and will be impossible to administer. It violates everything that has gone on before.

Vote for this rule. Bring back sanity and allow the States to do their job as they are supposed to do and as the law prescribes for them to do.

I urge support of this. I don't know if you are undecided on whether I was for this resolution or not. Just, for the record, yes, I support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 123, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF FINAL RULE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 123, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 123, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients (81 Fed. Reg. 91852; December 19, 2016), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 43, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

□ 1345

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my resolution of disapproval, H.J. Res. 43, which uses the authority of the Congressional Review Act to overturn the Obama administration's 11th-hour rule forcing States like Tennessee to fund abortion providers.

I want to begin today by stipulating very clearly what this resolution is about because, while I am unapologetically pro-life, you don't have to be in order to support this resolution. You just have to believe in the Tenth Amendment.

Despite the histrionics you may hear on the other side of the aisle today, with today's resolution, we are not, we are not, one, voting to defund Planned Parenthood in any way, shape, or form; we are not voting to cut title X funding; and we are not voting to restrict abortion rights.

Madam Speaker, we are simply voting today to affirm the rights of States to fund the healthcare providers that best suit their needs, without fear of reprisal from their own Federal Government.

I didn't realize this was a partisan issue. It shouldn't be, because that is how the title X grant program functioned for more than 45 years, until the Obama administration decided to leave this parting gift to abortion industry on its way out the door.

For me, this is a personal issue. As a registered nurse, I know that vulnerable women seeking true comprehensive care deserve better than abortion-centric facilities like Planned Parenthood. So, as a State legislator, I worked within my authority to make sure that Tennessee honored the will of